1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan'078 (Japan 11-207078) in view of either Fecho (U. S. Pat. No. 3,194,398 or Rickard et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 4,411,664).

Re claim 5, Japan'078 is cited disclosing a controlling method of a washing machine, comprising:

performing washing and rinsing operations in accordance with a start command inputted by a user and a procedure selected by the user (typical);

performing a laundry quantity measurement operation after the end of the washing and rinsing operations (see "load amount detected"); and

performing a preliminary spin drying operation (see "intermediate dehydration") when the measured laundry quantity is not smaller than a reference quantity value; and performing a main spin drying operation (see" high-speed dehydration") that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the drum type washing machine and the specific recitation of terminating the spin drying process after the main spin drying operation. The patent to Rickard is cited disclosing the termination of the spin drying process after the main spin operation (col. 9, lines 61-65). It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the system/arrangement of Japan'078, to include the termination of the spin drying process

after the main spin operation as taught by Rickard, with no change in their respective function, for the purpose of shutting down the washing machine. It is understood in the art that a washing cycle is expected to commence and eventually terminate at one point or another. As for the controlling a drum type washing machine, Fecho (col. 2, lines 3-10), disclose that it is old and well known in the art that certain operations may be employed in either a vertical or drum type washing machine. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the system/arrangement of Japan'078 to have the same employed in a drum type washing machine as taught by Fecho, with no change in their respective function, for the purpose of providing a certain amount of standardization, thereby reducing the cost of manufacturing similar components individually, for both types of machines. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination, (i.e., the combination of known old elements into a single device) would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Re claim, 10, Japan'078 discloses the preliminary spin not being performed as claimed. Re claim 13 and 14, Japan'078 disclose the one or more times.

3. Claim 6, 8 and 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Baek et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,029,299), Ito et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,539,753) or Matsuura et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,163,912).

Claim 6 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the laundry quantity is the volume of laundry loaded in a drum and/or the weight of the laundry after the rinsing operation. Baek (as at S22), Ito (col. 8, line 40) and Matsuura (as at 252) are each cited disclosing the laundry quantity as claimed It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the system/arrangement of Japan'078, to the laundry quantity measurement as taught by . Baek, Ito or Matsuura, with no change in their respective function, for the purpose of ensuring a precise measurement. It is understood that the weight of the laundry differs throughout a washing cycle. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination, (i.e., the combination of known old elements into a single device) would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Re claims 8 and 11, Baek (S31) discloses the eccentricity measurement.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims and/or the rejection thereof have been considered. The arguments and/or amendments with respect to the claims have been effective in defining over previous Office Action, with the current remarks standing moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/FRANKIE L. STINSON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792